DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 456 987 RC 023 187

AUTHOR	Karim, Gordon
TITLE	In Living Context: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Rethinking Rural Prevention.
PUB DATE	1997-05-00
NOTE	16p.; In: Rural Substance Abuse: State of Knowledge and Issues. NIDA Research Monograph 168; see RC 023 179.
AVAILABLE FROM	For full text: http://www.nida.nih.gov/PDF/Monographs/Monograph168/Download168.html.
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070) -- Opinion Papers (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Community Attitudes; Context Effect; *Cultural Context; Educational Needs; Educational Strategies; Elementary Secondary Education; *Prevention; *Program Design; *Relevance (Education); *Rural Areas; *Substance Abuse; Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

Evaluations of national prevention programs have found that they are not successful in reducing or preventing drug abuse. Local context must drive the design and development of prevention programs. Context is essential for success, and stereotypes concerning rural areas should be avoided. Local prevention efforts ought to be driven by sound inquiry into the local nature of substance use. Beyond a community-wide needs assessment, an ethnographic component designed to reveal how community members perceive substance use and abuse issues should be used in developing the prevention curriculum. In other words, prevention practitioners must develop an insider's understanding of drinking and drug taking to make the prevention message meaningful. The design and delivery of prevention curricula also need to take into account current information and knowledge regarding the most effective instructional methods and the ways in which young people learn best. Traditional models of education based on didactic principles are likely to be ineffective in terms of students' learning of prevention-oriented materials. Many traditional models of education no longer conform to young persons' understanding of the world, which is based on observation and experience. Prevention practitioners must weave the local context of substance use and abuse into standard curriculum areas and disseminate materials that are significant, relevant, and interesting to young people. (Contains 35 references.) (TD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

In Living Context: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Rethinking Rural Prevention

Gordon Karim

INTRODUCTION: TOWARD A HOLISTIC APPROACH

This chapter argues that knowledge of two factors—local context and latest teaching and learning models—is crucial in the successful dissemination of national school-based drug and alcohol prevention programs for young people in rural areas. Successful dissemination is defined as programs that achieve their intended goals (i.e., delaying the onset of alcohol and other drug (AOD) use and abuse or remediating the use among those already using). The chapter is not a critique or evaluation of programs such as the Drug Abuse Resistance Education (DARE) program, but rather it is an attempt to understand ways in which to increase their effectiveness. Although the chapter focuses on prevention in rural areas, it speaks broadly to the field of prevention.

This chapter makes two main points:

- Local context ought to drive the design and development of prevention programs. Without taking context into account, national programs are not likely to influence local conditions. Context is essential for success. Local prevention efforts ought to be driven by sound inquiry into the local nature of substance use. Beyond a communitywide needs assessment, an ethnographic component designed to reveal how community members perceive substance use and abuse issues should be used in developing the prevention curriculum. In other words, prevention practitioners must develop an insider's understanding of drinking and drug taking in order to make the prevention message meaningful.

- The design and delivery of prevention curriculums also need to take into account current information and knowledge regarding the most effective instruction methods and ways in which young people learn best. Traditional models of education based on didactic, sage-on-the-stage principles are likely to be ineffective

RC 023187

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

in students' learning of prevention-oriented material. Furthermore, many traditional models of education no longer conform to young persons' understanding of the world (i.e., an understanding based on observation and experience. Prevention practitioners must disseminate materials that are significant, relevant, and interesting to young people.

In conclusion, the chapter argues that the traditional prevention paradigm needs to abandon program-driven approaches (i.e., those based on risk/resiliency, risk and protective factors, self-esteem, and health models) in favor of a broad, unified, research-based understanding of substance abuse issues that is woven into an overall school reform or school improvement plan. Stand-alone programs such as DARE are doomed to fail if the bulk of the prevention responsibility is based on their successful implementation. If the problem of substance abuse is as critical as is believed, any solution must address its complex nature comprehensively.

The two points listed above are related to one another but are presented here in sequence so that there can be a better understanding of what each factor entails. The goal of this chapter is to develop a framework for reflecting the further development and dissemination of K-12 prevention programs.

Substance use and abuse among young people remains one of the top public concerns, but over the past several years prevention, as a means of remediation, has fallen from public consciousness as an important issue. This is despite the strong evidence that substance use among youth continues at basically the same rate as it did when prevention was at the top of the national agenda. It is time for those in the field of prevention to reflect and reevaluate its performance. Current prevention programming tends to be overly generalized, compensatory, planned rather than strategically fragmented, and of little relevance or meaning to young people and their lives, especially those who are at greatest risk.

In placing unreasonable expectations on programs such as DARE and the Million Dollar Machine, for example, there has been an avoidance of the harder work of understanding the social and cultural context in which substance use, abuse, and prevention take place and reforming the practice of education insofar as it is inextricable from AOD issues.

To make prevention relevant and meaningful to the youth culture, one must look to other disciplines and listen to other voices for a more

holistic understanding of the issues. This chapter is interdisciplinary precisely for that reason and is based on research and theory generated outside the traditional prevention paradigm (e.g., in telecommunications, anthropology, rural sociology, and education). These fields offer both a wealth of knowledge critical to understanding substance abuse and its prevention and a unified approach to understanding the relationship between substance use, abuse, and prevention and the circumstances in which they occur.

Two assumptions undergird this chapter. The first is that the primary vehicle for education of almost any sort, including alcohol and other drug prevention, ought to be the school. The second is that prevention, and how it has been practiced to date, has for the most part fundamentally failed in changing attitudes and behaviors towards substance use and abuse.

RURAL CONTEXT: DIVERSE AND DYNAMIC

Over the past several decades, policymakers and social service providers have treated the rural as a uniform residual of the urban (Hobbs 1994). That is to say, everything that is not urban or suburban is rural by default. This dichotomy and treatment of the rural is well documented and has often been cited as a major reason for the rural policy development failures of the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s. Just as many rural development programs exported to the developing world in the 1960s failed to consider local tradition and culture, so have many national programs failed to make a positive or significant difference in rural America.

Table 1 provides a brief inventory of some of the ways in which the rural has been conceptualized in the American mind, virtually in opposition to the urban.

Although regional and community diversity based on economic, cultural, language, religious, legal, political, demographic, ethnic, and sociological dimensions has always existed between rural places,[1] there are two reasons that rural settings have been treated uniformly: the assumption that rural communities are synonymous with small-scale agriculture, and the popular myth of the rural community as an unchanging, stable crucible of traditional American values.

The former is no longer true. Less than 1 percent of rural counties are economically dependent on small-scale farming (Focus on the Future

TABLE 1. *Typical contrasts between rural and urban.*

Urban	Rural
Heterogeneous	Homogeneous
Alienating	Communal
Economic diversity	Farm-sector dependency
Mercantile	Agrarian
Violent	Peaceful
Anonymity	Familiarity
Innovative	Traditional
Dynamic	Static
Dirty	Clean
Stressful	Relaxed

1988). As for the latter, one need only explore the ways in which popular culture has penetrated rural communities over the years.

Ironically, rural people see their own communities as fragile and fraught with urban dangers. A Roper survey conducted for the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association (NRECA) (1992) asked rural Americans what they considered to be the greatest threat to the future of rural America. An increase in crime (53 percent), alcohol abuse (52 percent), and increased use of illegal drugs (48 percent) ranked first, third, and fourth respectively. Still, most Americans have an idyllic perception of rural communities that is only now beginning to change (NRECA 1992).

The mythology about rural communities helps to explain why prevention curriculums have been either generic, "one-size-fits-all" designs, very often irrelevant to local conditions, or one generic "rural" model for all non-metropolitan communities, as though all rural communities were the same.

Neither approach can do justice to the unique context of an individual community. As the 21st century draws near, the rural myth has become less significant because it gives little information about the people, their socioeconomic status, culture, and day-to-day lives. The only characteristics one can assume about what is rural are that these areas have relatively smaller populations and fewer resources than their nonrural counterparts.

Technological and Economic Forces

Two forces are accelerating the rate at which rural places are changing and diversifying, and, therefore, modifying the way one must think of rural prevention efforts. These are:

- Globalization; that is, changing the socioeconomic and demographic character of rural communities and redefining the relationship of place to individual identity and access to resources. Accompanying these conditions are other changes such as the increase in low-wage, service-sector jobs, a general decline in wages and earnings, and an increase in working poor families (Hobbs 1994); and

- The telecommunications revolution, which has altered the situational geography of people and place. By creating opportunities in which distance means little or nothing, telecommunications has linked the social identity of groups of people regardless of location.

These two forces have not only altered the relationships between people and places but have synchronized social innovation and change as they unfold in metropolitan and nonmetropolitan places. Increasingly, where one lives has little influence on access to social changes, be it the introduction of trends in fashion or the substance of choice. The world that shapes the lives of people in rural and urban places is converging economically and physically (Donnermeyer 1994; Karim 1994).

Rural Americans are confronting social issues (e.g., violence and gang activity) previously regarded as purely urban phenomena (Donnermeyer 1992, 1994; Edwards 1992). Whereas some of these issues have always been a part of the rural landscape, even when camouflaged by the rural myth, the rural community of today is not immune to the pressures of global economics and subsequent social change.

However, the effects of technology and economic forces on already diverse rural communities are varied and unique, depending on local traditions, social structures, history, and perception of their own identity. In other words, technological and economic changes do not culturally homogenize these communities. The changes do, however, heighten the need to understand the relationship and dynamics between the local and the global events and lifestyles.

Building an Ethnographic Understanding

National prevention programs are sometimes based on resources that are incorrect, outdated, and do not address the root causes of substance use and abuse (Bangert-Drowns 1988; Elliott 1995; Pruitt 1993; Tobler 1986). Moreover, this material often relies on fuzzy concepts such as self-esteem. Prevention programs are needed that address the issues surrounding substance use within the contexts in which it occurs. These programs should be based on solid in-context research.

Context runs deeper than what has traditionally been thought of as what a community needs assessment reveals. Prevention messages must be woven into the real lives of people instead of existing outside local experience. This suggests that those designing prevention programs need to develop an insider's perspective on at-risk behavior.

Trotter (1993) outlined a framework to be used in ethnographic inquiry for the development of culturally relevant prevention programs especially designed to reach minority groups. Ethnographic inquiry has been used in the field of substance abuse for a long time (Agar 1973*a*, 1973*b*), and its benefits in understanding human relationships and critical issues have an even longer history (Agar 1986*a*, 1986*b*; Chambers 1985; Spradley 1979, 1980; Trotter 1993; Willis 1990). Such ethnographic methods should be used to design prevention programs. Moreover, the methods should be implemented by community members themselves. The utility of Trotter's framework for developing a minority-relevant understanding of substance use is that it can be applied to the study of various groups. It is included here with some modifications. The last two points have been added to Trotter's original four (see Segal 1995).

1. Develop an insider's view regarding drinking and drug taking behavior, paying special attention to:

    a. an understanding of the situations in which use occurs;

    b. the perceived risks and benefits of use within each situation;

    c. the actual consequences of use; and

    d. both individual and group (social) barriers to changing existing behavior.

2. Develop normative data on patterns of drinking and other forms of drug-taking and at-risk behavior.

3. Determine the extent to which individual attitudes are in compliance with group culture.

4. Keep prevention and intervention goals and objectives congruent with current behavior.

5. Determine the pleasures and gratifications individuals receive from drug-taking and nondrug-taking experiences.

6. Reach an understanding of users' attitudes and beliefs about nonusers and alternatives to substance use and abuse.

In summary, each community must be willing and able to design, develop, and deliver its own prevention strategy based on self-generated local knowledge. By local knowledge is meant a rich understanding of the insider's point of view (Geertz 1983) regarding drug taking, as outlined above; the circumstances surrounding drug-taking activities; and the local environment as defined by local traditions, patterns of social behavior, beliefs, and attitudes toward drug use and nondrug-related behaviors.

To support communities, national programs must provide a sound and consistent research base that relies on a multidisciplinary understanding of the root causes, motivations, and conditions that can lead to drug taking. They must also provide a framework for local inquiry, design, and development of prevention programs and refrain from presenting packaged, predesigned curriculums.

KNOWLEDGE CONSTRUCTION AND YOUTH CULTURE

In addition to placing prevention programming within a local context, prevention curriculums ought to be designed and taught in a way that is both meaningful and engaging to those who are supposed to benefit from it. Prevention programs will have greater success if they incorporate teaching and learning principles based on current research and ways to captivate the targeted population with material that is woven into the day-to-day, out-of-the-classroom, cultural and political lives of young people.

National and local prevention programs need to borrow from current educational and social research, which offers rich insights into optimizing learning opportunities by application of appropriate teaching strategies in a classroom. Essentially, the concern is with the way in which, and the process by which, learning of any curriculum takes place. Since prevention-related messages are an intrinsic part of the educational experience, it makes perfect sense to fully use the understanding of what methods of teaching and learning work best.

The importance of targeting youth, particularly those considered at risk, cannot be overstated. Material used should be culturally and politically relevant to all aspects of their lives and based on the assertion that primary educational experiences also take place outside of the school building through the consumption of popular culture and technology (e.g., Hebdige 1979, 1988; Willis 1990). One of the main challenges of prevention programs and curriculums is to make the educational experience meaningful and engaging enough that young people will participate and learn. Most national programs rely on didactic, transmission-reception models of learning, perhaps augmented by limited experiential learning activities. Current research on teaching and learning call for an educational model that focuses on the development of higher-order thinking skills such as problemsolving, scientific inquiry, and performing complex tasks (Means et al. 1993).

The focus on higher-order thinking skills is the basis for many State and local school reform efforts and represents a movement away from outcome-based education such as test scores and memory recall (Means et al. 1993). Construction of knowledge is best accomplished through direct experience, observation, inductive and deductive reasoning, and a series of other methods that eventually lead to knowledge.

The reform movement means changing roles for students and teachers. The new role for the teacher is to facilitate the students' navigation to discovery rather than to dictate information and assert answers. The student's new role is to participate in the learning process and understand how that process takes place.

Prevention practitioners need to invent ways to build programs around authentic, challenging, and engaging tasks. A major advantage to using reform instruction is the potential to engage students characterized as "disadvantaged" or "at-risk." When students are labeled or identified in these ways, they often suffer from diminished expectations from staff,

parents, and, worst of all, themselves. As a consequence, the development of advanced skills such as problemsolving, scientific inquiry, composition, and self-evaluation is thwarted by intensive drill-oriented instruction. Often they are isolated, physically and metaphorically, from the class. In most cases, these are precisely the students who stand to gain from reform instruction such as heterogeneous grouping and collaborative work.

Table 2 contrasts the learning and teaching principles of reform instruction with those of a conventional one.

TABLE 2. *Comparison of conventional and reform approaches to instruction.*

Conventional instruction	Reform instruction
Teacher directed	Student exploration
Didactic teaching	Interactive modes of instruction
Short blocks of instruction on single subject	Extended blocks of authentic and multidisciplinary work
Individual work	Collaborative work
Teacher as dispenser	Teacher as knowledge facilitator
Ability groupings	Heterogeneous groupings
Assessment of factual knowledge and discrete skills	Performance-based assessment

SOURCE: Means et al. 1993.

Whether or not this school reform movement takes hold is being observed closely by policymakers, researchers, and educators with equal interest and concern. Transforming the institution of primary education to meet the challenges of global competition and the information age has provided the impetus for the education reform movement. The argument presented here is that the way prevention and other health curriculums are taught should be the same as the way math, science, language skills, and other core curriculums should be taught in public schools. The limited success of current prevention curriculums should be enough to encourage the development of a curriculum that exercises principles of teaching and learning based on what current research shows works best.

Learning To Make Choices

Traditional transmission models of learning are at best loosely connected to the broad experiences of young people, and they are often viewed by students as authoritarian. For the young, the voice of authority is not necessarily the voice of knowledge and wisdom. Young people today have a far more sophisticated understanding of the world at an earlier age, perhaps because of telecommunications and popular culture, than did previous generations.

In large part because of the penetration of mass media and other forms of popular culture, young people are placed at greater risk—exposed to images of violence, substance use, and sex—often on a daily basis. Not only are they forced to think about critical issues such as pornography, abortion, love and morality, religion, right and wrong, what is truth, what is good, what is evil, drugs and alcohol, and other complex topics, but they are also put in positions of making difficult choices.

Children enter adolescence with questions that challenge previously held truths (Karim 1994) about the way in which the world operates. Young people understand the world as contradictory place in which truth and reality are not finite and quantifiable but ambiguous, ethereal, and elusive. While this ambiguity is often a source of personal conflict and crisis, it is at the same time collectively celebrated in forms that are alienating to adults. Popular media understand this best, and conflicting representations of right and wrong, permission and control, are reflected in advertising messages aimed at youth on television, in music, art, and films.

By not engaging adolescents in the same way as does popular culture, issues conveyed in traditional prevention messages are seen as forms of regulation and authority. Young people's understanding that knowledge is subject to time, place, context, and politics increases with age and experience. As they forge political and moral identities, prevention messages must be made relevant to their epistemological understanding of the world, as well as to the ways in which they think.

When school teachers, police officers, and other adults in the role of educating young people use the voice of absolute authority, they fail to recognize and acknowledge young people's previous knowledge of the world, built on observation and experience. Moreover, they may inadvertently undermine the effectiveness of the message they hope to deliver. Young people, who observe and experience issues related to ethical

choices as difficult dilemmas, will find it odd that pure knowledge, right and wrong, exist within the classroom or any other institutional setting.

Prevention messages must recognize these factors and design and deliver materials that frame issues as choices with particular outcomes, incorporate materials and anecdotes from young people's lives, and create an interactive learning environment by encouraging debate around these issues.

CONCLUSION: SCHOOL REFORM AND PREVENTION

Over the past several years, evaluation studies of prevention programs such as DARE have found that national programs are not successful in reducing or preventing drug abuse. For example, a 3-year study commissioned by the Department of Justice concluded that DARE was successful in meeting several objectives (e.g., as raising children's self-esteem, polishing social skills, and improving attitudes towards law enforcement), but failed to meet the programmatic goals of preventing or reducing substance use and abuse among students (Elliott 1995; Pruitt 1993).

Other studies suggest that almost all school-based drug prevention programs have had little success in preventing or reducing substance use and abuse. Two separate meta-analyses were done of a total of 175 school-based prevention programs; each concluded that these prevention programs were, on the whole, ineffective in meeting their intended goals (Tobler 1986; Bangert-Drowns 1988). Tobler went so far as to advocate for their discontinuation.

Pruitt's (1993) review of school-based prevention programs and prominent meta-analyses identified the reasons for program failure. Among others, these included: (1) wasted energy and the reinvention-of-the-wheel syndrome (i.e., the recycling of an existing curriculum that was not working), (2) lack of creativity in program development (most of the curriculums out there look alike despite their established ineffectiveness), (3) inadequate research and evaluation techniques (the lack of evaluation and the poor quality of those that have been evaluated), and (4) unrealistic expectations of programs and of schools for being solely responsible for implementing them—a point that has been made by countless practitioners, researchers, and commentators of prevention programs (Lohrmann and Fors 1986). Hixson (1995) has made the point that prevention programs place yet another demand upon schools already overburdened with trying to meet educational goals and standards. Hixson argues that the primary school

response to remediating at-risk issues is to add more programs to the daily curriculum. Programs such as DARE, It's Up To Me, Discover, and the Million Dollar Machine become yet another task teachers need to schedule. Staff, students, and administrators often respond in the same way: Here we go again!

At the same time, many of these observers recognize that the school is the environment in which young people socialize, exchange ideas with peers, find emotional support through peer and expert counseling, and connect with caring adults. Pittman and Cahill (1992) recognized the broad social role of schools as the natural site for fulfilling the needs of youth and have outlined a set of competencies that schools ought to build, ranging from citizenship and creativity to a sense of belonging.

Other writers (among them Cartwright 1993; Coontz 1992; Dryfoos 1990; Heath 1991) also argue that the responsibility of the school is broader than meeting the demands of a traditional curriculum. In their minds, schools ought to be at the center of community life, and for many at-risk students schools offer the only stable environment in their day-to-day lives (Flora et al. 1992; Hobbs 1994; Peshkin 1978) further emphasize the social importance of the school, observing that the rural school is often at the heart of the community's identity and even plays an intrinsic part in community economics and development (Hobbs 1994). This observation is based on community attitudes toward the school, empirical studies, and the effects of consolidation on community centrality or cohesiveness.

The critical point all of these scholars are making is that the school's role goes beyond the transmission of traditional subject matter and includes addressing issues of direct relevance to the lives of the youth (e.g., character-building, making moral and political choices, and developing civic responsibilities), although these issues are dealt with better by design than by default. Thus, it is the school that must contend with social issues such as substance use and abuse while meeting the challenges of school reform and education.

In a sense, school reform is being driven by both top-down and bottom-up forces. From the top down, schools must respond to the stark warning issued by Lund (1983) in "A Nation At Risk." Now more than a decade old, this report dramatized the need for educational reform to meet the demands of the 21st century workplace and global competition. From the bottom up, schools must respond to the variety of needs, pressures, and risks to which young people and the culture of youth, whether urban

or rural, are increasingly exposed. Thus, it may be more constructive to think of choices about drugs and alcohol as embedded in the entire array of life choices made by youth rather than as isolated, compartmentalized, discrete choices.

On the whole, national prevention programs, as currently designed, are incongruent with both top-down and bottom-up school reform. Their future success will depend on a careful redesign, so that they fit seamlessly within the school reform framework and become meaningful and engaging for youth in the sense that they recognize and address youth as a distinct subculture.

In this context, it is clear that the program approach to prevention remains ineffective. Rather, those concerned with the prevention and remediation of alcohol and substance use must develop and deliver a curriculum that builds a quality research-based consensus regarding the root causes of substance use and abuse, develops sound instructional methods that encourage building of higher-order thinking skills, find creative ways and methods to engage students with the context and message of prevention, and design a framework that schools can use to weave the local context of substance use and abuse into standard curriculum areas.

NOTE

1. Compare the rural South with the rural Midwest, for a very broad example.

REFERENCES

Agar, M.H. *Ripping and Running*. New York: Academic Press, 1973*a*.

Agar, M.H. Ethnography and the addict. In: Nadar, L., and Maretzki, T.W., eds. *Cultural Illness and Health*. Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association, 1973*b*.

Agar, M.H. *Speaking of Ethnography*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1986*b*.

Agar, M.H. *Independents Declared: The Dilemmas of Independent Trucking*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1986*a*.

Bangert-Drowns, R.L. The effects of school-based substance abuse education: A meta-analysis. *J Drug Educ* 18:243-264, 1988.

Cartwright, M. *For the Child: Lessons from a Visionary Principal*. New York: Doubleday, 1993.

Chambers, E. *Applied Anthropology: A Practical Guide*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1985.

Coontz, S. *The Way We Never Were: American Families and the Nostalgia Trap*. New York: Basic Books, 1992.

Donnermeyer, J. The use of alcohol, marijuana, and hard drugs by adolescents: A review of recent research. In: Edwards, R., ed. *Drugs & Society: Drug Use in Rural American Communities*. Vol. 7, No. 1/2. Binghamton, NY: The Haworth Press, Inc., 1992.

Donnermeyer, J. Crime and violence in rural communities. In: Midwest Regional Center for Drug-free Schools and Communities, ed. *Perspectives on Violence and Substance Use in Rural America*. Oak Brook, IL: North Central Regional Educational Laboratory, 1994.

Dryfoos, J. *Adolescents at Risk: Prevalence and Prevention*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Edwards, R., ed. *Drugs & Society: Drug Use in Rural American Communities*. Vol. 7, No. 1/2. Binghamton, NY: The Haworth Press, Inc., 1992.

Elliott, J. Drug prevention placebo: How DARE wastes time, money, and police. *Reason* March 1995.

Flora, C.; Flora, J.; Spears, J.; and Swanson, L. *Rural Communities: Legacy and Change*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1992.

Focus on the Future: Options in Developing a New National Rural Policy. Proceedings of the Rural Development Policy Workshops. College Station, TX: Texas Agricultural Extension Service of the Texas A & M University System, 1988.

Geertz, C. *Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretive Anthropology*. New York: Basic Books, 1983.

Heath, D. *Schools of Hope: Developing Mind and Character in Today's Youth*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1991.

Hebdige, D. *The Meaning of Style*. London: Routledge, 1979.

Hebdige, D. *Hiding in the Light*. London: Routledge, 1988.

Hixson, J. *Pathways to Prevention: Confronting the Challenge of High Risk Behavior Among Urban High School Students*. Oak Brook, IL: North Central Regional Educational Laboratory, 1995.

Hobbs, D. The rural context for education: Adjusting the images. In: Midwest Regional Center for Drug-free Schools and Communities, ed. *Perspectives on Violence and Substance Use in Rural America*. Oak Brook, IL: North Central Regional Educational Laboratory, 1994.

Karim, G. *Sturgis, Michigan: Confronting Change in a Rural Community*. Oak Brook, IL: North Central Regional Educational Laboratory, 1994.

Lohrmann, L.D., and Fors, S.W. Can school-based educational programs really be expected to solve the adolescent drug abuse problem? *J Drug Educ* 16:327-339, 1986.

Lund, L. *Ten Years After "A Nation at Risk."* New York: Conference Board, United States National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983.

Means, B.; Blando, J.; Olson, K.; Middleton, T.; and SRI International. *Using Technology to Support Education Reform*. Washington, DC: Office of Education Research and Improvement, 1993.

National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. *Public Attitudes Toward Rural America and Rural Electric Cooperatives*. Survey conducted by The Roper Organization, Inc., New York, June 1992.

Peshkin, A. *Growing Up American: Schooling and the Survival of Community*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1978.

Pittman, K.J., and Cahill, M. "Pushing the Boundaries of Education: The Implications of a Youth Development Approach to Education, Policies, Structures, and Collaborations." Paper presented at the 1992 Summer Institute of the Chief State School Officers, New York, July 1992.

Pruitt, B.E. Drug abuse prevention programs: Do they work? *NASSP Bull* 77(552):37-49, 1993.

Segal, B. Prevention and culture: A theoretical perspective. In: Leukefeld, C., and Clayton, R., eds. *Drugs & Society: Prevention Practice in Substance Abuse*. Vol. 8, No. 3/4. New York: The Haworth Press, Inc., 1995. pp. 139-147.

Spradley, J.P. *The Ethnographic Review*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1979.

Spradley, J.P. *Participant Observation*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1980.

Tobler, N.S. Meta-analysis of 143 adolescent drug prevention programs: Quantitative outcome results of program participants compared to a control or comparison group. *J Drug Issues* 16:537-564, 1986.

Trotter, R. "Ethnographic Methods and Inhalant Use Among Three Ethnic Populations." Paper presented at the Inhalant Conference, Fort Collins, CO, August 1993.

Willis, P. *Common Culture: Symbolic Work at Play in the Everyday Cultures of the Young*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1990.

AUTHOR

Gordon Karim, M.A.A.
Rural Project Specialist
North Central Regional Educational Laboratory
1900 Spring Road, Suite 300
Oak Brook, IL 60571